DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 083 EC 302 784

AUTHOR Jellie, Carol Rees
TITLE Implementing a Collaborative Consultation Model To Improve Success in Mainstream Courses for Secondary Learning Disabled Students.
PUB DATE 29 Nov 93
NOTE 73p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Consultation Programs; Costs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Learning Disabilities; *Mainstreaming; Models; Program Development; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Secondary Education; Secondary School Students; *Study Skills; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This practicum developed a program to improve the mainstreaming of secondary level students with learning disabilities through provision of: (1) inservice training workshops on the topic of collaborative consultation for regular and exceptional (special) educators, and (2) study skills seminars for the students. In addition to the inservice workshops and student seminars, the practicum involved development of a packet of training information for inservice participants, administration of seminar surveys, development of mechanisms for mainstream cost factor funding, and coordination of meetings for teacher course descriptions and student inventories. Evaluation indicated that collaborative consultation was a successful model for mainstreaming this population. Appendices include forms, seminar descriptions, workshop materials, student inventory, and rating scales. (Contains 35 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 083

Implementing A Collaborative Consultation Model To Improve Success In Mainstream Courses For Secondary Learning Disabled Students

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

Carol Rees Jellie

Cluster 45

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Rees Jellie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum II Report presented to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 303784

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described,

Verifier: Donna Brennan

Assistant Principal

Melbourne, Florida

August 28, 1993
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Carol Rees Jellie under the direction of the advisor listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

11-29-93
Date of Final Approval of Report

Mary Staggs, ED.D Advisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are many people I would like to thank for their help in the completion of this practicum. This process began with the kind direction of Dr. Mary Staggs, my practicum advisor. I also want to thank Terry Mermann, a true collaborator. My report could not have been completed without the help of my Mom, my favorite proofreader. Thanks to my husband and daughter for their patience and neverending support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES. v

ABSTRACT. vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community. . 1
Writer's Work Setting and Role. 3

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description. 4
Problem Documentation. 8
Causative Analysis. 10
Relationship of the Problem to the
Literature 12

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations. 17
Expected Outcomes. 17
Measurement of Outcome. 18

IV SOLUTION STPATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions. . . 20
Description of Selected Solution. 27
Report of Action Taken. 28

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results. 35
Discussion. 38
Recommendations. 41
Dissemination. 43

REFERENCES. 44

Appendices

A	COOPERATIVE PLAN MONITOR FORM.	48
B	EVALUATION SKILLS-BUILDING SEMINARS. . . .	50
C	STUDENT INVENTORY/SECONDARY LEVEL.	52
D	COURSE DESCRIPTION/SECONDARY LEVEL.	54
E	AGENDA OF SKILLS-BUILDING SEMINARS.	56
F	LEARNING DISABILITIES INSERVICE WORKSHOP. .	58
G	COOPERATIVE PLANNING WORK FORM..	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1	Teacher Assessment of Academic Skills. . .	32

ABSTRACT

Implementing A Collaborative Consultation Model To Improve Success In Mainstream Courses for Secondary Learning Disabled Students. Rees Jellie, Carol. 1993: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Inservice Training/Secondary/Teacher Education/Regular and Special Education/Collaborative Consultation

This practicum was designed to provide a blueprint for mainstreaming learning disabled students. Inservice training workshops in collaborative consultation for regular and exceptional (special) educators were organized along with study skills seminars for learning disabled students.

The writer planned and presented inservice training for regular and special educators to assist them in understanding specific learning disabilities; prepared a packet of training information for inservice participants; taught skills-building seminars; administered seminar surveys; prepared mechanisms for mainstream cost factor funding; coordinated the meetings for teacher course descriptions and student inventories.

Analysis of the data revealed that collaborative consultation was a successful model to mainstream learning disabled students. The relationship between the exceptional educators and the mainstream teachers was enriched by the increased communication and valuable exchange of information.

****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (✓) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of materials.

10/18/93
(date)

Carol Rees Jellie
(signature)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

The work setting of this practicum was a secondary educational facility located in an urban area centered in a community of 200,000 in a county on the southeastern coast. The tax base in this region was generated by light industry, aerospace support industry and tourism. The school served an upper middle class population, with extensive busing to provide access for students in the surrounding areas. This secondary school was unusual in that it is also the designated learning center in its area for children identified as emotionally handicapped (E.H.), as well as for children identified as learning disabled (L.D.). In addition to day school this facility also offered evening community college credit courses as well as adult education courses.

The physical plant of the school centered around a twenty-year-old structure with three classroom and

administrative wings perpendicular to two connecting outdoor corridors. Several special purpose buildings were in close proximity to the classrooms, the auditiorium, media center, physical education facilities, playing fields and music studios.

There were approximately 100 classroom teachers, three full time counselors and a department lead specializing in exceptional education (special education) placement and counseling. Additional staff included five administrators, two library and media specialists, six full time administrative support staff, one teacher assistant for exceptional education, 15 custodial and 11 cafeteria workers, to serve nearly 1450 students.

There was a cooperative, constructive relationship between the twelve exceptional education teachers and school administration. The exceptional education teachers were required to be certified to teach specific learning disabilities or emotionally handicapped students, depending on their class assignments and staffing needs. The exceptional education teachers were generally supportive of one

another and enjoyed an "open door" policy with the principal and his staff.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The teaching placement of the writer at the time of this practicum was as "teacher on assignment" which included exceptional education department lead, guidance committee chairperson, exceptional education counselor, and staffing coordinator for the exceptional education department. Main employment tasks were focused on the staffing and placement of exceptional education students from local junior high schools, other counties, and other states. Responsibilities included creating the yearly master schedule for the exceptional education department, teacher class assignments, and scheduling regular diploma students into mainstream classes.

The school served both part time and full time emotionally handicapped, learning disabled and non-handicapped students in a variety of service models, including self-contained, resource tutorial classes and in-school vocational placement.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

In this school many exceptional education students were not experiencing success in the mainstream. Teachers were not making appropriate modifications for the learning disabled students in their classrooms. Over fifteen students requested schedule changes into other courses or with other teachers because they were worried they may not be successful in a particular course. Social studies and science classes appeared to be the most difficult subjects for the learning disabled students to grasp. The students' complaints were focused on one of several concerns: the fact that the student didn't understand any of the material, the teacher spoke too fast for the student to take notes properly, or the student could follow the course work, but could not pass a test or quiz.

Mainstreaming exceptional students into regular classes continued to be an important educational trend,

this school had to deal with that reality and gave greater support for mainstreamed disabled students. Mainstreaming was the popular term for educating handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. Public Law 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975) mandated the adaptation of curriculum, methods and materials to meet the individualized needs of handicapped students.

This law protected the rights of the handicapped but also projected the idea that handicapped children need assistance regular teachers could not provide. (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988). Historically, special needs students were taken from their regular classrooms to be educated in special settings, usually segregated, self-contained classrooms. Contrary to this placement, there was an educational trend toward the progressive inclusion of exceptional students back into the mainstream (Stainback & Stainback, 1985). At this secondary school more and more students were being phased into mainstream classes without a proper monitoring structure in place to allow for their success.

A major constraint in developing an integrated system of education for regular and exceptional education students was attitudinal in nature (Lipsky and Gartner, 1989). There was belief that the reintegration of exceptional students into the mainstream was not possible without changing the perception of regular teachers on the learning abilities of exceptional students (Fuchs, Fuchs, Fernstrom, & Hohn, 1989). Some regular teachers held negative positions concerning the integration of exceptional students into their classrooms and were not willing to facilitate course work to meet the needs of exceptional students.

Certainly there was a general lack of knowledge on the needs of individual disabled students in the mainstream classes. This was evident by the reports of regular teachers on the lack of success of some exceptional educational students in their classrooms and the need for assistance in modifying the curriculum. Usually this report was followed by a request to remove the child from that class to placement in an exceptional education class.

Secondary subject area teachers in basic education and vocational teachers were often frustrated teaching exceptional education students. Regular classroom teachers have not been trained on the assessment of the individualized needs of the disabled child. Typically, at this secondary school, student needs were not clearly conveyed to the regular teachers by the exceptional education staff to enable them to discern what course modifications might be appropriate. Research detailed the lack of development of effective interventions for many mainstreamed students (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988). To complicate the issue, regular teacher expectations were not clearly transmitted to the students so they could attempt to adjust to particular teaching styles. Students mainstreamed for many of their classes have difficulty coping with the idiosyncrasies in the teaching styles of regular (mainstream) teachers.

Extensive multidisciplined assessment was oriented on student placement rather than instructional support. Guidance committees placed students according to assessment data, but generally didn't address specific classroom modifications needed to support the student

in mainstream classes. Regular classroom teachers lacked the necessary support to adequately teach to the needs of the exceptional child. They have not been given the responsibility to provide individualized education for the exceptional child in their classes.

Exceptional education students mainstreamed into subject area classes or vocational electives often required an additional support system to allow them to reach their potential. Skills taught in more restrictive settings were not often critical for adaptation in less restrictive environments. Students were not always prepared for transfer to a less restrictive class (Fuchs, Fuchs, Fernstrom, & Hohn, 1989). Regular classroom teachers were not receiving support regarding practical suggestions to teach exceptional students in their classrooms.

Problem Documentation

Evidence of the lack of mainstream support for exceptional students was supported by documented teacher concerns, parental conferences and student input.

Teachers in subject area courses have regularly requested student information and teaching strategies to assist them in helping particular learning disabled students in their classes. Documentation at this school provided data that none of the mainstream teachers in core subject area courses have certification in exceptional education areas that would assist them in dealing with diverse student populations. General interventions were suggested by the exceptional education counselor or teachers, such as notetaking skills or outlining techniques, but they may not be appropriate modifications for individual student needs. On an ongoing basis, parents requested educational techniques to allow their children more success in course work. After the mid-term progress reports, at least ten parents called to discuss their child's progress in certain courses. Parent-teacher conferences were often arranged to identify and manage learning problems.

Students placed in mainstream classes recurrently required resource classes and pullout programs to help them complete assignments, tests, or simplify course work in required core area classes. In several

instances, either the student or teacher had identified an academic problem and had requested additional assistance. To respond to this need, a resource class was scheduled for one period per day to provide assistance to students who were experiencing difficulty in class, and the teacher was unable or unwilling to modify the curriculum presentation to allow the students to be successful. Four learning disabled students had a pull-out resource class to assist with social studies classes. Two of these students were receiving help with World History, one with American Government, and one with Economics. Five other students were attending the resource class sporatically for assistance as needed. The option of pull-out was not the least restrictive environment for the students and disrupted the student's integration into the mainstream class.

Causative Analysis

There were five major causes to the problem of mainstreaming exceptional students. First: Regular education teachers were not trained on the assessment of the individualized needs of the learning disabled

student. This identification of the needs of disabled students would also increase the awareness of the individualized needs of all students. Three students had totally avoided attending particular mainstream classes because they found them too difficult. After their absences were discovered, adjustments were made to give them more mainstream support.

Second: As a general rule teachers did not use strategies for the education of exceptional learners. In discussion with several teachers, they, for the most part, did not alter their teaching techniques to suit the individual need of their students. Some teachers did not accept the responsibility for the disabled students mainstreamed into their classes. An informal review of the lesson plans of ten core area teachers did not note any adjustments or provisions for individual student needs.

Third: Student strengths and weaknesses were not generally shared with the mainstream teachers. Processing deficits and intervention strategies were not discussed during the transition of a student into mainstream classes or at registration time. Mainstream teachers were invited to Individual Education Plan

(I.E.P.) meetings to discuss students' needs but seldom were able to attend due to scheduling conflicts. Often, after the fact, the I.E.P. goals and objectives were not shared with the mainstream teachers. Vasquez-Chairez and McMillan (1988) emphasized the requirement for instructional staff to spend less time on assessment and more time on instructional delivery.

Fourth: Teacher requirements were not clearly transmitted to the student so they could attempt to adjust to the teacher's delivery style. Students were expected to adapt to the teacher's expectations, in some cases without adequate preparation.

Last: Support networks were not firmly established to provide assistance to both basic and vocational teachers and mainstreamed learning disabled students. Interventions were put in place as a reactive rather than proactive measure.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

The roles of the classroom teacher and the exceptional education teacher were changing. The needs of the students were directing this change (Grzynkowicz, Wirtz, Cation & Bullock, 1974). After the

passage of Public Law 94-142 to accommodate the specialized needs of exceptional students, they were placed in self-contained classes that were homogenous disability groupings. They were taught in isolation of mainstream students and neither student could benefit by the interaction with the other. Research was begun to analyze how the integration of exceptional and regular educators, programs and resources might best be used to present a unified, comprehensive system capable of meeting the needs of all students in regular education (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989).

The review of the literature gave evidence as to the need for interactive communication between the basic and exceptional education staff to adapt to the needs of the exceptional student in the mainstream classroom.

Educational references as well as research into rehabilitation were explored to gain a greater understanding of the problem. The current practice was to refer students with academic difficulties in school to the multidisciplinary team for a psychoeducational evaluation, with the expected result of placement in exceptional education. Research shows that three to

five percent of the school population was being referred each year (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988). Referrals required an extensive, time consuming multidisciplinary psychoeducational assessment. Referrals could be inappropriate for learning problems that might be resolved in the regular classrooms. The current system led to an overidentification of students for exceptional education. Kennedy (1989) documented a 140 percent increase in the classification of students in learning disabled categories from 1976 to 1986. The reason for rapid growth included improved assessment techniques, liberal eligibility requirements, and the lack of alternatives for students experiencing problems in regular classes. The message given to teachers was that the needs of the learning disabled could not be met by the regular classroom teacher because of a lack of knowledge or skills.

Evaluation processes focused on compliance with exceptional education eligibility criteria rather than on functional performance and behavior. The negative consequences of the approach to service delivery for special children were numerous. Existing practices did not result in the development of effective intervention

services for children (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988).

The Regular Education Initiative in Anchorage, Alaska Public Schools has studied the problem of the least restrictive environment for exceptional education students, and the interventions required for student success in mainstreamed classes (Kennedy, 1990). Alternatively, exceptional educators were considered as the only available support for students who are at-risk in school. The problems presented by these students were sometimes too great for any one teacher to successfully address (L'Anse Cruese, 1991).

Research confirmed that regular teachers assume they have little responsibility and expertise to help students with learning problems. Students with mild learning difficulties, but no handicapping condition were identified and placed in an exceptional education program in order to receive help. When exceptional students were segregated from their peers, labelling and stigmatization could have resulted. This labelling could have further isolated these students from their peers and increased negative attitudes about school and learning (L'Anse-Cruise, 1991).

Regular educators often expressed concern that they do not have the expertise to teach exceptionl learners. They were troubled that teaching the learning disabled child in their classrooms would take time away from regular classroom activities (Kennedy, 1990). Research and practice illustrated the fact that the knowledge, skills and attitude required to successfully teach exceptional students were the same requirements needed to teach the "regular" students. All teachers can learn to individualize and modify their programs to suit a variety of learners in the classroom. Good teaching practices which included cooperative goal setting, appropriate instructional objectives, and grouping in ability levels in the mainstream would be appropriate interventions for students with a great range of learning abilities (Reynaud, Pfannensteil, & Hudson, 1987).

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The goal of this writer was to meet the academic needs of learning disabled students through a needs-based student-centered consultative approach in mainstream classes.

Expected Outcomes

The following goals and outcomes were projected for this practicum:

1. Mainstream teachers and exceptional educators would participate in an interactive communication process.

2. Mainstream teachers and exceptional educators would share the responsibility of implementing collaborative consultation plans and monitoring student progress.

3. Student needs would be determined and plans would be made to accommodate those needs in the classroom.

4. A structured system of support would be established to assist in the academic success of the exceptional student.

Measurement of Outcomes

The success of this collaborative consultation with mainstream teachers was evaluated by the success of the modifications for the exceptional education students in their classes. This inter-teacher communication, whether written or verbal was the primary device used to notify the exceptional education consultant of any problems, complications, or successes in the mainstream classroom.

To facilitate mainstreaming, student progress was monitored regularly to determine success in the mainstream class, and allow for any adjustments and modifications in programming. Regular notations on a cooperative plan monitor form (see Appendix A) allowed the mainstream teacher and exceptional education consultant to keep a log of outcomes, comments, and

events to maintain appropriate interventions (Riegel, Mayle, & McCarthy-Henkel, 1988).

The justification and effectiveness of the collaborative consultation service model was assessed by monthly contact meetings with the teachers and students involved, discussing the classroom progress of each student.

Students also completed evaluations of each study skills seminar as to the usefulness of that particular seminar for their individual needs (see Appendix B).

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation Solutions

Learning disabled students were not experiencing success in the mainstream. The primary problem was that teachers were not making appropriate modifications for the disabled students in their programs.

The literature generated a great deal of interest in the collaborative consultation delivery model as a solution for the mainstream support of exceptional students (Reed, 1983, Vasquez-Chairez & MacMillan, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1988; Dyke & Dettman, 1989; Merrill, 1989; Reisberg & Wolf, 1986). Research confirmed the effectiveness of collaborative consultation in varied educational settings. Studies demonstrated the effectiveness of consultative models as a process for providing individualized services when exceptional students are included in regular classes. Consultation referred to the problem solving process

that involved the collaborative effort of two or more people to benefit the student for whom they were responsible (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988). Collaborative consultation was a structured situation where by the exceptional education teacher and the basic education or vocational teacher worked together to plan alternatives for students having difficulty in classes.

Central to this consultative process was a strong communication base. Teachers shared the responsibility and the expertise in implementing individual plans and monitoring student progress. Teaching strategies basic to a collaborative consultation model had the potential of transfer to students not placed in exceptional education. The entire class can benefit by strategies used to teach exceptional students. Teacher input after the consultative model was in place, can describe any residual effects for the nonhandicapped classroom students. In this student centered approach, instruction was based on academic and social learning needs rather than by specific categories of exceptionality (Idol, Paolucci-Whitman & Nevin, 1986; Riegal, Mayle & McCarthy-Henkel, 1988).

There were several principles basic to collaboration (Riegal, Mayle,& McCarthy-Henkel, 1988; Luckner, Rude, Sileo, 1989; Carter, 1989). Team ownership of the problem was required. There was also a recognition of individual differences in academic progress. The use of collaborative models of instruction could then improve the skills, knowledge, and attitude for all members of the team. Instructional decisions were based on functional analysis of behaviors and academics for all students (Idol, Paolucci-Whitman & Nevin, 1986).

Vasquez-Charez and MacMillan (1988) stated evidence from meta-analysis of data. They reported that the average consultation participant was better off than 68 percent of nonparticipants considering attitudinal, behavioral and achievement variables. There was additional evidence to indicate that consultation had improved achievement among students that have disruptive behavior.

Commonalities in program delivery included professional responsibility, creative problem solving and learning strategy techniques. Aspects of collaborative consultation also included managing

resistance, establishing effective consultant-consultee relationships and discussing interpersonal variables (Posgrove & McNeil, 1989).

The Iowa Department of Education (1988) produced a reference handbook entitled "Accommodation Strategies". This program had similar components to the Pine County, Minnesota Model (Tindal, 1987) and L'Anse Cruise Public Schools reference guide (1991) describing the structure of secondary mainstreaming programming for exceptional education students.

West (1985) examined the preferences of elementary and exceptional education teachers for four school based consultation models (collaborative, expert, medical and mental health). Results of the survey suggested a strong preference for the collaborative model of service delivery.

A Vermont Consulting Teacher Program trained consulting teachers to deliver instruction by training classroom teachers as change agents (Paolucci-Whitcomb & Nevin, 1985).

The expertise of the classroom teachers, preservice teachers, and college consultants were combined to

develop a consultative model to implement science units in an elementary curriculum (Balajthy, 1991).

In another school, a parent involvement and teacher cooperative consultation program was developed to increase secondary academic achievement levels (Basford, 1990).

Researchers often had different titles for service delivery models, but there were parallel foundations to all programs. Intervention assistance was one method of providing services to students with learning problems. The goal of this model was to expand instructional options for the student in the least restrictive environment. In this team approach roles were specified to avoid duplication of services. Strong leaders, exceptional education staff or administrators empowered to change or modify the existing organization structure must drive this change. All teachers on the team needed to be involved in the process and operation of the alteration in delivery methods as they strived to accommodate diverse classroom populations (Pugach & Johnson, 1990).

The Regular Education Initiative (Kennedy, 1990: Lipsky & Gartner, 1989) and the Learning Support System

in Scotland, stressed the responsibility of the regular classroom teachers in educating students. The Mastery in Learning Project illucidated many of the collaborative strategies that provided support for students in the mainstream (Blythman & Warren, 1989).

Donaldson and Christianson (1990) discussed a decision-making model as a guide for selecting appropriate intervention strategies for the individual needs of exceptional education students. Garden City Public Schools (1973) and Reed (1987) elaborated on the team approach for mainstreaming exceptional students. Choice Awareness as a consultation process was outlined by Nelson and Shifron (1985).

A survey of secondary counselors revealed the consultant role of an educational counselor ranked sixth in importance. Additional data supporting the initial survey indicated that consulting is a primary counseling skill and function (Hett & Davies, 1985).

An international study from Scotland reiterates the need for the development of a "learning support system" for mainstreaming special needs students (Blythman & Warren, 1989).

Walsh (1991) continued to reseach the cooperative teaching service delivery model. Regular classroom teachers and exceptional teachers provided cooperative teaching in the regular classroom rather than having the exceptional student "pulled-out" of a regular class for special needs support.

Pre-referral intervention, teacher-assistance teams and building level support teams were other consultative delivery models that effectively supported regular educators with inclusion issues (Zins, Curtis, Graden & Ponti, 1988).

Other areas to be scouted included the exploration of consultative models used in other schools. Research was conducted to investigate the availability of teacher inservice training programs to assist in the establishment of a school-wide collaborative model.

Administrative and county resource teacher input into the planning stage of the collaborative consultation model ensured the foundation for implementation will be strong, and the atmosphere accepting.

Description of Selected Solution

Research detailed the importance of the development of a collaborative consultation model to assist regular classroom teachers and vocational teachers in defining alternatives to teach learning disabled students in their mainstream classes. The delivery model increased the shared responsibility of regular and exceptional educators in teaching exceptional students.

Clarification of the classroom modifications necessary to help disabled students become more successful in the mainstream classes was a focus of the consultative model. A collaborative consultation system was also instrumental in increasing the interactive communication between regular and special educators. The modifications suggested to accommodate the special needs of the exceptional student will help to decrease the stigma and labelling of the learning disabled student in the regular class and should enable them to feel a part of the class.

To provide the skills needed for regular teachers to successfully implement modifications for exceptional students in the mainstream, a structured program was

assimilated to guide the implementation of the consultation. The Hunt-Riegel Model was the collaborative consultative training and implementation model adopted. The structures defined in this system were used to facilitate implementation of this program.

To expand the knowledge of the mainstream teachers and lay the groundwork for continued success at collaborative consultation amd mainstreaming, an inservice training session for the school faculty was presented focusing on the needs and classroom modifications for learning disabled students.

Report of Action Taken

As an initial step in this process, this proposal was shared with the school administration to get approval for implementation.

Collaborative consultation forms and documents were organized to facilitate the documentation and monitoring of the implementation. Parent notifications for student participation in the collaborative process were sent home. A copy of the monitoring log (see Appendix A) was included in the exeptional education

audit to document the student's participation for the purpose of mainstream cost factor funding.

An inservice training session, conducted by the county trainer for collaborative consultation, was scheduled during school hours to allow all mainstream and exceptional education teachers time to participate during their planning periods. Four separate one hour sessions permitted the maximum number of teachers (with 100 on staff) and administrators to take advantage of the inservice training. Inservice points, credited towards re-certification in any subject area, were awarded at the completion of the one hour inservice training to provide an extra incentive for teachers to attend. The meetings included information for teachers to understand the varied academic problems of learning disabled students, and internalize general aspects of the collaborative process.

Due to the current availability of state mainstream cost factor funding, this collaborative consultation approach provided the required documentation for additional resources for the school. To maximize this funding it was suggested by the administration that the number of student courses

targeted for this intervention exceed seventy. In keeping with this formula, forty students were processed and monitored for collaborative consultation. As a result of the student identification, twenty-six mainstream teachers were asked to participate in the collaborative consultation program. Permission was requested and approved to provide inservice points for mainstream teacher's participation in this semester long program.

Two exceptional education teachers were chosen to assist with the implementation of a collaborative consultation model. They had the expertise to help initiate, monitor, and maintain the program. Their schedules were adjusted to allow non-teaching time for them to plan and coordinate consultative services. Information gleened from exceptional education audit files was used to assist in the identification of student strengths and weaknesses. Processing deficits according to psychological reports, were noted on student inventories.

The appropriate student inventory forms and course descriptions were completed by the exceptional education consultants, students and the regular

teachers to initiate the collaborative consultation process.

Students were assessed according to their learning styles and academic problems on the student inventory form (see Appendix C). Disabled students were able to indicate their strengths and weaknesses in regular class settings in the areas of information output and information input.

The consultative team met with the mainstream teachers to help establish course adjustments for individual student needs as well as the continued training of the mainstream teachers on collaborative consultation. Course descriptions (see Appendix D) were completed by the mainstream teachers to identify instructional methods and the types of class assignments used on a regular basis.

According to responses on the course description forms, over fifty percent of mainstream teachers required their students to be adept at notetaking skills (see Table 1).

Table 1

ACADEMIC SKILLS NEEDED

Academic skills required for success in class as indicated by mainstream subject area teachers of Science, Mathematics, English, Social Studies, and Electives.

*Subject Area-	Sci	Math	Eng.	S.S.	Elec.	Ttl
Asking Questions in Class	2	3	1	3	0	9
Categorizing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Class Discussion	2	3	3	3	1	12
Completing Assignments	3	3	3	4	1	14
Following Directions	2	3	2	4	1	12
Getting Started	2	0	1	2	1	6
Independent Work Skills	3	1	3	2	1	10
Learning from Demo	4	2	0	1	0	7
Learn/Oral Presentation	4	2	1	4	1	12
Learn/Tape Presentation	0	0	2	0	0	2
Listening	3	2	2	3	0	3
Mathematics	0	3	0	0	0	3
Oral Expression	0	0	2	0	0	2
Organization	0	2	2	0	0	4
Paying Attention	2	2	2	3	1	10
Reading Content Material	4	1	1	7	1	14
Recalling Specific Info	0	2	2	3	1	8
Remembering (General)	0	2	2	2	0	6
Seeing Relationships	0	1	2	0	1	4
Staying on Task	1	2	2	3	1	9
Study Skills	0	1	1	0	1	3
Taking Notes	3	2	1	5	1	12
Taking Tests	0	2	2	2	1	7
Thinking Skills	2	2	1	1	1	7
Transferring Info	0	0	1	2	1	4
Understanding Vocabulary	1	1	2	0	0	5
Working in Groups	2	1	3	0	1	7
Writing	1	0	4	2	1	8

(R. Hunt Reigel, 1988)

*Sci =Science
Math=Mathematics
Eng =English
S.S.=Social Studies
Elec=Electives
Ttl =Total

As documented on the student inventory forms, twenty-five percent of the students recognized their weakness in notetaking skills. There seemed to be a deficiency in this area that the individual teachers might not address.

After meeting with teachers and students, there was a significant amount of agreement that many of the students were deficient in notetaking skills, outlining skills, and oranizational skills. In addition to the original proposal and to offer support in these skill areas, seminars were conducted with small groups of students participating in the collaborative consultation process. To meet this need, the students were excused from class for study skills seminars, on a staggered schedule one hour per week for five consecutive weeks (see Appendix E).

To allow for realistic notetaking experiences, portions of teaching sessions in Oceanography, American Government, and Psychology were videotaped. The tapes, combined with other instructional materials, were the focal point for the five skills-building seminars. These multi-modal presentations included passages from students texts to practice outlining and notetaking.

Motivational and organizational tips were offered from several sources. The hands-on practice and modeling of notetaking techniques along with student generated critiques were strategies used to present this skills information.

Regular consultative meetings were scheduled with participating teachers to maintain the effectiveness of the program. Logs were kept on each student to document the success of the course modifications (see Appendix A). To satisfy the requirements of the mainstream cost factor funding, monthly notations on the monitoring form were required.

An inservice training session for the school faculty gave an overview as to the definition, causes, characteristics, and suggested classroom modifications for learning disabled students. Handouts for the learning disabilities workshop included an agenda, a definition of the disability, causes, characteristics and simulation exercises (see Appendix F).

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

In this school many exceptional education students were not experiencing academic success in mainstream classes. Teachers were not making appropriate modifications for the learning disabled students in their mainstream classes. There was a need for the increased involvement and communication between the exceptional education and regular teaching staff. This involvement helped disuade many of the teachers from negative positions concerning the abilities of the learning disabled students.

Teacher feedback confirmed that collaborative consultation was an effective tool providing the groundwork for increased communication between the exceptional and regular teaching staff. This created the foundation for future cooperative activities. Due to the necessary communication throughout this collaborative process, the mainstream teachers were

empowered to share the responsibility of monitoring student progress. Professional relationships were established, new teachers were indoctrinated and a support network was created.

Student needs were determined by documenting strengths and weaknesses on a student inventory form completed with the help of an exceptional education teacher (see Appendix C). Student needs were then compared with the course description forms completed by the classroom teacher (see Appendix D). This comparison resulted in matches or mismatches between students' abilities and teacher course expectations. As a result of the surveys, strategies were discussed with mainstream teachers to better accommodate the disabled child in the classroom. These were noted on the cooperative planning work form (see Appendix G). A structured system of support was established to assist in the academic success of the exceptional student. This system proved to be an effective means of individualizing modifications to suit the specific needs of the disabled student. An additional benefit to mainstream teachers involved in the collaborative consultation was their increased awareness and

heightened sensitivity to the needs of all students in the classroom.

Of the twenty-six (26) teachers involved in the collaborative consultation for the purpose of this program, over one-third required notetaking as a needed academic skill for success in their course. A breakdown of academic skills needed by subject area was recorded to study and compare the class requirements of each teacher (see Table 1).

Students completed the student inventory form showing specific difficulty and strength areas (see Appendix C). The skills-building seminars were tailored to meet these concerns. The student evaluations of the skills workshops were very positive (see Appendix B).

According to teacher feedback, the inservice session on learning disabilities was extremely helpful (see Appendix F). New teachers gained information to help them be more comfortable helping the learning disabled students in their classes. Seasoned veterans had a refresher course to remind them of the needs of learning disabled students.

As a result of the collaborative consultation program and documentation, a basis for the mainstream

cost factor funding of consultative services was established. As a direct offshoot of this process, there was additional funding allocated for one basic education teacher unit. In this school the unit was used to fund the collaborative consultation coordinator position.

Discussion

Research showed there was a need for the inclusion of disabled students in mainstream classes in order to teach them in the least restrictive environment required by law. The benefits of mainstreaming are numerous, including:

Reduces stigma
Enhances social status
Provides appropriate peer models
Provides more cognitively stimulating environment
Resembles a "real world" environment
Provides more flexibility for service delivery
Serves more students, therefor reducing costs
Decentralizes services
Avoids isolation
(Reigel, Mayle, & McCarthy-Henkel, 1990)

There still remains the need for a continuum of services from self-contained to total inclusion in the mainstream. This is due to the various deficits and strengths of the individual students. On a hierarchy of most to least restrictive placement:

> Self-contained classes would provide intensive highly individualized instruction.
>
> Resource help to provide specific skill instruction focused on individualized needs.
>
> Consultation support to regular teachers who have students with learning disabilities.
>
> Accommodations and modifications in the mainstream classes to provide minor support needed for the disabled students to meet the group expectations (DLD, 1993).

In the secondary school there were a multitude of complex situations that might have affected a student's learning. Flexibilty was built into this program to allow for changes and adjustments to better suit the needs of the students and teachers.

The teacher's attitude towards a handicapped student can make a difference in that student's performance. Additional research outlined aspects of programs that would aid in the appropriate placement of learning disabled students.

Vasquez-Charez and MacMillan (1988) commented on the importance of communication and cooperation that would bring exceptional and regular educators together considering attitudinal, achievement and behavioral variables thus simplifying the mainstraming process.

A Vermont Consulting Teacher Program used this consultative model to train their teachers to be change agents in their school, reiterating the need for professional cooperation to streamline the consultation process (Paolucci-Whitcomb, & Nevin, 1985).

Teachers seldom have the opportunity to consider their teaching styles and their classroom needs and expectations. The structured format of this collaborative consultation process offerred them the occasion for this introspection.

The flexibilty of the program allowed for the addition of study skills seminars to strengthen skills

the majority of the participating teachers and students felt were required.

Each participant had to take responsibility for mainstreaming exceptional students. This was a key step in successful collaboration. Since there was a need for constant interaction between mainstream and exceptional education staff, one of the most important outcomes of this report was the heightened awareness of the responsibiltiy to work and react as a unit to better help and serve the disabled child.

Recommendations

It is important to remember the mainstream, subject area teachers have their own course requirements and it is necessary to be aware of their expectations. The same staff that is involved in mainstreaming disabled students is also involved in teaching multi-phased students. Time constraints are often imposed on the regular teachers by the structures and objectives built into their courses. Flexibility is a required aspect of the mainsteaming process.

Teacher meetings scheduled during planning times were sometimes poorly attended. Scheduled afterschool

meetings prior to teacher dismissal, were more successful. It is the responsibility of the collaborative consultant coordinator to plan these efforts with the mainstream teachers, and initiate the activity.

During the collaborative consultation process it became evident that many of the mainstream subject area teachers were not fully aware of the legal aspects, definition, characteristics, and processing deficits specific to learning disabled students. It was obvious that increasing this knowledge would facilitiate the collaborative process in the coming year. This faculty-wide learning disability inservice might be suggested as the first step to a successful mainstreaming program.

Mainstreaming is a continuing process that requires the collaboration of regular and exceptional educators. The mainstreaming process should be scheduled so that the teachers have adequate lead time to attend the sessions. A standardized collaborative consultation process is a requirement for the inclusion of disabled students into the mainstream. The expectations should be clear and followed accordingly

so that all contributors can participate in the achievement, and benefit by the structure.

Collaborative consultation is a process that can take several years to be accepted and utilized to the maximum in a school. Each year more teachers should be involved in collaborative consultation. The classroom modifications and interventions for the disabled student will benefit all students.

Dissemination

This collaborative consultation model will be shared with the middle and junior high schools articulating students to the secondary schools to create a continuum of services for the disabled student. Further inservice training sessions on mainstreaming and handicapped awareness will provide an environment for optimum learning and teaching for the disabled student.

References

Balajthy, E. (1991). A school-college consultation model for integration of technology and whole language in elementary science instruction. Field Study. State University of New York, Geneseo College at Geneseo.

Basford, L.D. (1990). Improving academic achievement and self-esteem in secondary students through parental involvement and teacher cooperative consultation. Education Specialist Practicum.

Blythman, M. & Warren, M.B. (1989). A mainstream support system that works: Scotland's system of learning support. Pointer, 33, 27-32.

Carter, J. (1989). The fact and fiction of consultation. Academic Therapy, 25, 231-42.

Division of Learning Disabilities (1993). Inclusion: What does it mean for students with learning disabilities? Pamphlet from Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Va.

Donaldson, R., & Christianson, J. (1990). Consultation and collaboration: a decision-making model. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, 22-25.

Dyke, N., & Dettmer, P. (1989). Collaborative consultation: A promising tool for serving gifted students with learning disabilities. Journal of Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities International, 5, 253-64.

Fuchs, D, Fuchs, L. Fernstrom, P. & Hohn, M. (1989). Achieving responsible reintegration of behaviorally disordered students. Dept. of Special Education. George Peabody College for Teachers, Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee.

Garden City public Schools, Michigan. (1973). Demonstration model: Garden City Michigan resource room-helping teacher teams for school year 1972-73. Research Report. Garden City Public Schools, Michigan.

Grzynkowicz, W., Wirtz, D., Cation, R., & Bullock, B. (1974). Meeting the needs of learning disabled children in the regular class. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Hett, G. & Davies, A. (1985). The Counselor as consultant. General Report. British Columbia, Canada.

Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitman, P., & Nevin, A. (1986). Collaborative consultation. Rockville, MD.: Aspen.

Kennedy, S. (1990). The regular education initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. Research Report. Anchorage, Alaska.

Keystone Area Education, Elkader, Iowa. (1988). Accommodation strategies for mildly handicapped students. Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

L'Anse Cruese Public Schools (1991) Co-teaching: regular education/special education and co-teaching reference guide. Paper based on a monograph presented at the annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children. (69th, Atlanta, GA, April 1-5, 1991).

Lavoie, R. (1990) How difficult can this be? F.A.T. City Workshop. PBS Video Greater Washingon Educational Telecommunications Assoc., Inc.

Learner, Janet (1985). Learning disabilities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Lipsky, D., Gartner, A. (1989). Beyond separate education for all. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Luckner, J.,Rude, H., & Sileo, T. (1989). Collaborative consultation: a method for improving educational services for mainstreamed students who are hearing impaired. American Annals of the Deaf, 134, 301-04.

Merrill, K. (1989). Collaborative consultation and instructional effectiveness: merging theory and research into practice. B.C. Journal of Special Education, 13, 259-66.

Nelson,R., & Shifron, R. (1985). Choice awareness in consultation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24, 298-306.

Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Nevin, A. (1985). Preparing consulting teachers through a collaborative approach between university faculty and field based consulting teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 132,43.

Polsgrove, L., & McNeil, M. (1989). The consultation process. Remedial and Special Education, 10, 6-13.

Pugauch, M and Johnson, L. (1990) Fostering the continued democratization of consultation through action research. Teacher Education and Special Education, 13, 240-245.

Reed, J. (1987). Using a team approach when mainstreaming special needs students. Business Education Forum, 41, 3-4.

Reed, P. (1983). Mainstreaming in secondary schools: a shared professional responsibility. OATE-OACTE Monograph Series No. 7. Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education: Ohio Association of Teacher Educators.

Reigel, R.H., Mayle, J., & McCarthy-Henkel (1988). Beyond Maladies and Remedies. Novi: R. Hunt Riegel.

Reisberg, L., & Wolf, R. (1986). Developing a consulting program in special education: implementation and interventions. Focus on Exceptional Children, 19, 1-14.

Reynaud, G., Pfannensteil, T., & Hudson, F. (1987). Park Hills secondary learning project. An alternative service delivery model implementation manual. Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City Div. of Vocational Ed.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1985). Integration of students with severe handicaps into regular schools. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Tindall, G. & Others. (1987). Mainstream consultation in secondary settings. Journal of Special Education, 21, 94-106.

Vasquez-Chairez, M. & MacMillan, R. (1988). Creating school-site change through collaborative consultation. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children. (66th, Washington, DC, March 28-April 1, 1988.

Walsh, J. (1991). Student, teacher, and parent preferences for less restrictive special education models: cooperative teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children. (69th , Atlanta, Ga. April 1-5, 1991)

West, J. F. (1985). Regular and special educators' preferences for school-based consultation model: a statewide study. Technical Report 101 Texas Univ., Austin Department of Special Education.

Zins, J., Curtis, M., Graden, J., & Ponti, C. (1988). Helping students succeed in the regular classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

COOPERATIVE PLAN MONITOR FORM

COOPERATIVE PLAN MONITOR FORM

Date of Student/Course Comparison: _____

COURSE: _____ STUDENT: _____

TEACHER: _____ SUPPORT STAFF: _____

Problem Area(s)	Alternative(s) To Be Tried (Plan) Are there others in the class with similar problems?	Person Responsible

MONITORING QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED

DATE	TIME REQUIRED	OUTCOMES, COMMENTS AND LOG OF EVENTS

Copyright 1988 For further information, contact RHR Consultation Services 39951 Jason Court, Novi MI 48050
Used by permission of R. Hunt Riegel

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION SKILLS-BUILDING SEMINARS

Evaluation of Skills-Building Seminars

Please Circle the Best Choice:

1= not helpful 2= somewhat helpful
3= helpful 4= very helpful

The skills-building seminars...

1. Will help me be a better student	1	2	3	4
2. Increased my organizational skills	1	2	3	4
3. Helped with notetaking skills	1	2	3	4
4. Helped me with outlining skills	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

STUDENT INVENTORY/SECONDARY LEVEL

STUDENT INVENTORY (Secondary Level)

Date Reviewed _____

Student: _____ Exceptionality: _____ Age: _____ Grade: _____

School: _____ Exceptional Ed. Teacher: _____

Basic Achievement: Reading Level: _____ Source: _____ Math Level: _____ Source: _____

Exceptional Education Support:

0 classes _____ 1-2 classes _____ 3-4 classes _____

+ Strengths (commensurate with non-handicapped peers)

O Weaknesses in regular class settings

INFORMATION INPUT
(How Student Learns)

_____ TEXTBOOK READING
_____ WORKSHEET PRESENTATION
_____ LECTURE
_____ DISCUSSION
_____ A-V MATERIALS
_____ CONCRETE EXPERIENCES
_____ OBSERVATIONS

_____ TEACHER-DIRECTED ACTIVITY
_____ INDEPENDENT WORK
_____ PEER TUTORS
_____ WITH AN ADULT
_____ IN A SMALL GROUP
_____ WITH THE WHOLE CLASS

INFORMATION OUTPUT
(How Student Responds)

SHORT-ANSWER TESTS _____
ESSAY TESTS _____
MULTIPLE CHOICE/MATCHING _____
TRUE/FALSE TESTS _____

COMPLETING WORKSHEETS _____
SHORT PAPERS _____
TERM PAPERS _____
DEMO./LAB. PROJECTS _____
ART OR MEDIA PROJECTS _____
ORAL REPORTS _____
GROUP DISCUSSION _____
COMPUTATION _____
MATH WORD PROBLEMS _____
MAPS, CHARTS OR GRAPHS _____

OTHER Learning Observations:	OTHER Response Observations:

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS: _____

I.E.P. GOALS: _____

Copyright 1983. For further information, contact RHR Consultation Services, 35951 Jason Court, Novi, MI 48050.
Used by permission of R. Hunt Riegel.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

COURSE DESCRIPTION/SECONDARY LEVEL

COURSE DESCRIPTION
(Secondary Level)

Department: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

Course Title: _____ Grade ____ Teacher: _____

Textbook _____ Text reading level: ___

General goal(s) of the course: _____

Preferred contact method: _____

√ Techniques used in class

* Used most frequently (e.g., daily)

INFORMATION INPUT
(Instructional Methods)

____ TEXTBOOK READING
____ WORKSHEET PRESENTATION
____ LECTURE
____ DISCUSSION
____ A-V MATERIALS
____ CONCRETE EXPERIENCES
____ OBSERVATIONS

____ TEACHER-DIRECTED ACTIVITY
____ INDEPENDENT WORK
____ PEER TUTORS
____ WITH AN ADULT
____ IN A SMALL GROUP
____ WITH THE WHOLE CLASS

OTHER Instructional Methods:

INFORMATION OUTPUT
(Types of assignments)

SHORT ANSWER TESTS _
ESSAY TESTS _
MULTIPLE CHOICE/ MATCHING _
TRUE/FALSE TESTS _
COMPUTATION _
MATH WORD PROBLEMS _

COMPLETING WORKSHEETS _
SHORT PAPERS _
TERM PAPERS _
DEMO./LAB. PROJECTS _
ART OR MEDIA PROJECTS _
ORAL REPORTS _
GROUP DISCUSSION _
COMPUTATION _
MATH WORD PROBLEMS _
MAPS, CHARTS OR GRAPHS _

OTHER Assignment Types:

GRADING CRITERIA: _____

EXTRA CREDIT: _____

© 1987, RHR Consultation Services 19951 Itson Court, Novi, MI 48050

APPENDIX E

AGENDA OF SKILLS-BUILDING SEMINARS

AGENDA
SKILLS-BUILDING SEMINARS

Collaborative Consultation

After meeting with teachers and students, there was a significant amount of agreement that many of the students identified were deficient in the following three areas:

Notetaking skills

Outlining

Organizational Skills
i.e. completing assignments
being prepared for class

To this end, it was decided that these students would be pulled out of class one time per week for five consecutive weeks.

Week 1	Instruction on Organization
Week 2	Instruction on Notetaking Skills
Week 3	Video Notetaking Experience
Week 4	Instruction on Outlining
Week 5	Outlining Exercises

APPENDIX F

LEARNING DISABILITIES INSERVICE WORKSHOP

AGENDA

LEARNING DISABILITIES INSERVICE WORKSHOP

1. Definition of Learning Disabilities
2. Causes of Learning Disabilities
3. Characteristics of Learning Disabled
4. Processing Deficit Simulation (taken from the Video F.A.T.City, 1990)
5. Reading Comprehension Exercise (Video F.A.T. City, 1990-begin VCR at count 1595)
6. Modification Strategies

Handout #1 Learning Disabilities Workshop

LEARNING DISABILITIES WORKSHOP

Definition:

1. The learning disabled have difficulties with academic achievement and progress. Discrepancies exist between a person's potential for learning and what he or she actually learns.
2. The learning disabled show an uneven pattern of development (language development, physical development, academic development).
3. Learning problems are not due to environmental disadvantage.
4. Learning problems are not due to mental retardation or emotional disturbance.

The definition accepted by the Association for Adults and Children with Learning Disabilities in 1984 states learning disabilities are a chronic condition of presumed neurological origin which selectively interferes with the development, integration, or demonstration of verbal or nonverbal abilities.

Some famous learning disabled people include: Albert Einstein, Thomas Edison, Greg Loganis, Cher, Tom Cruise and Bruce Jenner.

Example of a letter from nineteen year-old Thomas Alva Edison. He was considered slow and had to be taught by his mother at home.

Dear Mother- Started the store several weeks. I have growed considerably don't lik much lik a Boy now- Hows all the folk did you recive a Box of books from memphis that he promised to send them- languages. Your son Al (Lavoie, 1990).

Handout #2 Learning Disabilities Workshop

CHARACTERISTICS

The primary characteristics of a learning disability is a significant difference between a child's achievement in some area and his or her overall intelligence. Learning disabilities typically affect five general areas:

1. Spoken language: delays, disorders and deviations in listening and speaking.
2. Written language: difficulties with reading, writing and decoding.
3. Mathematics: problems with arithmetic operations or in understanding concepts.
4. Reasoning: difficulty in integrating and organizing thoughts.
5. Memory: problems in remembering information and instructions.
   (Lavoie, 1990)

Specific Learning Disabilities

1. Visual perception problems (dyslexia) frequently confuse letters that look alike, omit and add words or jumble spaces between words.
   Ex. No wisthe ti fo alpoobmen t com toth aib of the rcountry.
   (Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country).
2. Auditory perception problems. Difficulty differentiating between sounds, or acutely sensitive to background noises. Auditory perception problems can make it hard to catch the implications of different tones of voice.
3. Spacial perception problems- affects a person's ability to judge distance, differentiate between right and left, and follow directions.

Handout # 3 Learning Disabilities Workshop

WHAT CAUSES LEARNING DISABILITIES?

The causes are unknown, but some general observations are:

Some children develop and mature at a slower rate than others in the same group--"maturational lag".

An unexplained disorder of the nervous system.

Injuries before birth or in early childhood may cause a learning problem later.

Learning disabilities tend to run in families and may be inherited. Experts estimate approximately ten percent of the school population is learning disabled.

Some learning disabilities appear to be linked to the irregular pronunciation and structure of the English language. The incidence of learning disabilities is lower in Spanish or Italian speaking countries.

The following inconsistencies that exist in English spelling are illustrated in the following limericks: (Learner, 1985).

A king, on assuming his reign,
Exclaimed with a feeling of peign:
"Tho I'm legally heir
No one here seems to ceir
That I havn't been born with a breign"

A young lady crossing the ocean
Grew ill from the ship's dizzy mocean,
She called with a sigh
And a tear in her eigh,
For the doctor to give her a pocean.

Handout #4 Learning Disabilities Workshop

Learning Disabilties Simulation Exercise

n. "saidB y. "W eto di cku i or
"Comeo ets ehav pth sc n.

eqon' not fqodc
W thava her cano orn."

"Arew ngt tdobcor tha t'age nth r?
egoi oea n eno efloo

"Wec was Betsyan ed."Tha goodi an
an hit," swer t'sa pea",saipSus

"Wc was meo lofy dusqui tub."
an it.Co n, al ou. Hel cki

Thech owo ook ongti tod
ildrenw entt rk. Itt emal me oit.

Betsy du ecor tw ns utint ove
tth nin ogogda toq he n.

(Lavoie, 1990 taken from the video F.A.T. City. This simulation was projected across the screen)

Handout #5 Learning Disabilties Workshop

LEARNING DISABILITIES SIMULATION TRANSLATION

"Come on", said Betsy. "We have to pick up this corn. We don't have another can of popcorn."

"Are we going to eat popcorn that's been on the floor?"

"We can wash it," Betsy answered. "That's a good idea", said Susan.

"We can wash it. Come on all of you. Help me pick it up."

The children went to work. It took them a long time to do it.

Betsy put the corn in two big pans to put into the oven.

APPENDIX G

COOPERATIVE PLANNING WORK FORM

COOPERATIVE PLANNING WORK FORM

Date of Student/Course Comparison: _____

COURSE: _____ STUDENT: _____

TEACHER: _____ SUPPORT STAFF: _____

Problem Area(s)	Q	Alternative(s) To Be Tried	Person Responsibl
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		
	Q		

Copyright 1988 For further information, contact RHR Consultation Services, 39951 Jason Court, Novi, MI 48050
Used by permission of R. Hunt Riegel